



---

# **Red Team III**

## **on**

# **ISS Utilization Management**

September 27, 2002



# Agenda

---

8:00	Introductions and Team Process Simpson	Jerry
8:15	Review of Center Directors Meeting and Red Team III Meeting Purposes	Mary Kicza
8:45	Blue Team Report	Robin Henderson
9:15	Red Team Review	Red Team III
11:45	Break	
12:15	Red Team III Debrief to Mary Kicza and Blue Team	John Campbell
1:00	Adjourn	



# Red Team III Membership

---

- Jerry Simpson Co-Chair
- Dr. John Campbell, Co-Chair
- Dr. Jan Davis
- Dr. Dave Leckrone
- Rudolph Saldana
- Maynette Smith
- Ray Sparnon
- Charles Stegemoeller
- Dr. Eugene Trinh



# Red Team III Charter

27 September Review

---

- Review Blue Team updates to the Evaluation Criteria, Weighting factors and Scoring rationale. Review options. Recommend changes if required
- Provide oral and written recommendations to the OBPR Associate Administrator and Blue Team



# Options

---

- All options assume continuous improvement
- Reinvention
  - Option not supported by Center Directors
- A hybrid option of Institute and FFRDC apparently would have the highest score
- Red Team III did not (and could not without days of work) review the very detailed Blue Team definitions of an Institute and FFRDC



# Evaluation Criteria

---

- Evaluation criteria are useful and usable
- The segmentation between Safety, Technical, Business and Implications is an appropriate grouping that allows the Agency to focus on internal areas of improvement and external solicitations



# Weighting Factors

---

- The Blue Team presentation to the Center Directors should also show the results for the CD weightings
- **The weightings appear to provide additional discrimination between an Institute and an FFRDC only in the area of Implications**
  - **We recommend a careful review of this area both in the areas of weighting and scoring**
- The weighting was useful since it forced the Blue Team and the Center Directors to think about what was important



# Scoring Rationale

---

- Scoring on Safety, Technical and Business was highest for maximum performance.
- **Scoring on Implications was highest for minimum impact to NASA, resulting in a high score for reinvention**
  - This assumes that minimum impact is the most desirable outcome
  - If the Agency is willing to accept more than minimum change impact, then the scoring of the criteria should be changed





# Observations

---

- We agree that all options must include Continuous Improvement
  - Improvement is necessary both within the internal utilization structure and external program interfaces, i.e., NASA wide
- The impediments that might prevent the Institute and FFRDC from reaching the level of performance implied by the high scores must clearly be identified
  - **An action plan should be created to remove the impediments**
- Given the limited time available, the Red Team could not fully evaluate the details of the options, scoring, and weighting



# Conclusion

---

- Within the time available, we could not identify anything obviously wrong with the conclusions
- We do not recommend additional Red Team review unless Senior Management provides guidance requiring significant rework
- We commend the Blue Team for a very professional, complete set of products that fully incorporate the previous Red Teams' recommendations